United Nations A/C.2/67/SR.34

General Assembly
Sixty-seventh session

Official Records

Distr.: General
30 January 2013

Original: English

Second Committee

Summary record of the 34th meeting
Held at Headquarters, New York, on Friday, 7 December 2012, at 10 a.m.

Chair: Mr. Talbot ..... (Guyana)

Contents

Agenda item 17: Information and communications technologies for development (*continued*)

Agenda item 20: Sustainable development (*continued*)

(h) Harmony with Nature (*continued*)

Agenda item 22: Globalization and interdependence (*continued*)

(a) Globalization and interdependence (*continued*)

Agenda item 23: Groups of countries in special situations (*continued*)

(a) Follow-up to the Fourth United Nations Conference on the Least Developed Countries (*continued*)

Agenda item 24: Eradication of poverty and other development issues (*continued*)

(a) Implementation of the Second United Nations Decade for the Eradication of Poverty (2008-2017) (*continued*)

Agenda item 20: Sustainable development (*continued*)

(g) Report of the Governing Council of the United Nations Environment Programme on its twelfth special session (*continued*)

This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned *within one week of the date of publication* to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Corrections will be issued after the end of the session, in a separate corrigendum for each Committee.

12-63545 (E)

Please recycle

The meeting was called to order at 10.30 a.m.

Agenda item 17: Information and communications technologies for development (*continued*) (A/C.2/67/L.35/Rev.1)

Draft resolution A/C.2/67/L.35/Rev.1: Building connectivity through the Trans-Eurasian Information Super Highway

1. **The Chair** said that the draft resolution had no programme budget implications.

2. **Mr. Aliyev** (Azerbaijan) made a minor oral correction to the draft resolution and said that Afghanistan, Canada, India, Japan, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lebanon, New Zealand, Pakistan, the Republic of Korea, the Republic of Moldova, the United Republic of Tanzania and the United States of America had become sponsors.

3. **The Chair** announced that Gabon and Guatemala had also joined the sponsors.

4. *Draft resolution A/C.2/67/L.35/Rev.1, as orally corrected, was adopted.*

5. **Mr. Sahakov** (Armenia) said his delegation hoped that the adoption of the draft resolution would promote regional cooperation for the benefit of all stakeholders. The Trans-Eurasian Information Super Highway should be open to all interested States and should not create more favourable conditions for those whose aim was to use economic projects as tools for their own political goals.

Agenda item 20: Sustainable development (*continued*) (A/C.2/67/L.34/Rev.1)

Draft resolution A/C.2/67/L.34/Rev.1: Entrepreneurship for Development

6. **Ms. de Laurentis** (Secretary of the Committee), reading out a statement of programme budget implications, said that the thematic debate provided for in paragraph 16 of the draft resolution was expected to comprise one morning meeting and possibly an additional afternoon meeting, with interpretation in the six official languages and verbatim record coverage for the plenary meeting or meetings only. Those meetings would be covered by the entitlement of the General Assembly on the understanding that they would not take place in parallel with other meetings of the Assembly. The dates should be determined in consultation with the Department for General Assembly and Conference Management.

7. The report of the Secretary-General provided for in paragraph 17 of the draft resolution would add one 8,500-word document in all official languages to the documentation workload of the Department for General Assembly and Conference Management. Should the General Assembly adopt the draft resolution, the corresponding additional requirements in the amount of $50,900 would be included in section 2 of the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2014-2015.

8. **Ms. Davidovich** (Israel) made minor editorial corrections to the draft resolution and said that Albania, Barbados, the Central African Republic, Chad, the Congo, Dominica, Guyana, Liechtenstein, Madagascar, the Marshall Islands, Mongolia, Norway, Peru, Saint Lucia, Samoa, San Marino, the Seychelles, South Sudan, Timor-Leste, Tonga and Zambia had become sponsors.

9. **The Chair** announced that Vanuatu had also become a sponsor.

10. **Mr. Jawhara** (Syrian Arab Republic) said that, as in previous years, Israel was attempting to take advantage of the Committee by giving the impression that it was a peace-loving State committed to sustainable development. The occupation authorities wished to draw attention away from their persistent violations of human rights principles and international resolutions. Although the occupying Power had submitted a draft resolution on entrepreneurship for development, it had paralyzed the social and economic life of the Occupied Palestinian Territory and the occupied Syrian Golan. In the latter, it was violating international law by enacting various projects on Arab land in cooperation with Western companies. It continued to bury toxic waste, uproot trees and destroy properties, thereby preventing the Arab inhabitants from accessing natural resources and water. It had put an end to an arrangement, negotiated through the International Committee of the Red Cross, which had made it possible for apples farmed in the occupied Syrian Golan to be sold in other parts of the Syrian Arab Republic.

11. Only a few days previously, the General Assembly had granted Palestine the status of observer State. The occupation authorities had retaliated immediately by authorizing the construction of 3,000 additional settlement units around the Palestinian

capital, Jerusalem, and withholding Palestinian tax revenue that was needed in order to pay salaries and maintain infrastructure. The Israeli occupiers clearly had no intention of promoting a just and comprehensive peace.

12. By voting against the draft resolution, the Committee would send a strong signal that Israel should comply with international resolutions and end its occupation of Arab territories. Member States that supported Palestinian statehood should also recognize the right of the Palestinian people and the inhabitants of the occupied Syrian Golan to build their own institutions and pursue sustainable development in accordance with the outcome document of the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development (Rio+20), "The future we want", contained in annex to General Assembly resolution 66/288.

13. **Mr. Al-Hajri** (Oman), speaking on behalf of the Group of Arab States in explanation of vote before the voting, said that the Israeli occupation continued to prevent the Palestinian people from exercising their right to development, as documented in reports prepared by the Economic and Social Commission for Western Asia (ESCWA) (A/67/91-E/2012/13) and the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD) (TD/B/59/2). That situation was strikingly at odds with Israel's claim to promote sustainable development. The Group of Arab States had attempted to introduce some balance to the text, but the proposed changes had been rejected. Its members would therefore vote against the draft resolution.

14. **Mr. Khalil** (Egypt) speaking in explanation of vote before the voting, said that the draft resolution focused excessively on national policies for entrepreneurship, ignoring the need for a conducive international environment. Developing countries could not rely solely on the domestic market; they needed an open multilateral trading system complemented by technology transfer and capacity-building. Moreover, the draft resolution did not take into consideration the ESCWA and UNCTAD reports, which demonstrated that the Israeli occupation was the principal obstacle to the development of the Palestinian economy; the land available for agriculture was being steadily reduced and the blockade on the Gaza Strip prevented the inhabitants from engaging in trade. In view of the subject of the draft resolution, those realities could not be ignored.

15. His delegation had taken part in the negotiations on the draft in an effort to address those concerns. Some areas of agreement had been found, but other delegations had subsequently reneged on those understandings. His delegation would therefore vote against the draft resolution.

16. *A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.2/67/L.34/Rev.1.*

In favour:

Albania, Andorra, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Mozambique, Myanmar, Nauru, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Palau, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Senegal, Serbia, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Sudan, Spain, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tuvalu, Uganda, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Zambia.

Against:

Algeria, Bahrain, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Egypt, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon,

Libya, Malaysia, Maldives, Mauritania, Morocco, Nicaragua, Oman, Pakistan, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, Turkey, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Yemen.

Abstaining:

Afghanistan, Bangladesh, Brunei Darussalam, China, Ecuador, Mali, Mauritius, South Africa, Zimbabwe.

17. *Draft resolution A/C.2/67/L.34/Rev.1 was adopted by 129 votes to 31, with 9 abstentions.*

18. **Mr. Kaganda** (United Republic of Tanzania) said that his delegation had sponsored the draft resolution because it believed that, given a conducive international environment, entrepreneurship had great potential for the promotion of sustainable development. His Government had always been supportive of the Palestinian cause and was therefore concerned that the goal of the draft resolution had been obscured by regional considerations, setting a dangerous precedent. His delegation hoped that, in future, the Committee would continue to seek consensus as a means to build confidence and resolve issues of an economic, political and social nature in a constructive manner.

19. **Mr. Prosor** (Israel) said that the sponsors and supporters of the draft resolution included nations from all parts of the globe, developing and developed alike. That support reflected a growing awareness that entrepreneurship was a critical driver of development and had a ripple effect; by unlocking minds, it inspired change. Business leaders built teams and instilled confidence. Entrepreneurs were dreamers and risk-takers who dared to change the world and offered developing communities the best hope for breaking the cycle of poverty.

20. Israel and the other sponsors of the draft resolution had hoped for consensus on the draft resolution since every country benefitted from empowering its entrepreneurs. However, the Group of Arab States had announced that it would oppose its adoption even before the negotiations had ended. Few regions could benefit from entrepreneurship more than the Arab world; people across the region had risen up precisely because they demanded better lives, better economies and better governance, as well as an end to rampant corruption, economic stagnation and discrimination against women. The draft resolution represented hope and progress for people across the planet. By opposing it, the representatives of Arab States — like their Governments — had turned their backs on their own people, sending the message that they cared more about petty politics than about human prosperity. The Committee should not allow those delegations to hold back humanity in its pursuit of innovation.

21. Israel's experience showed that each country's greatest natural resource was its people. In just six decades, the State had transitioned from a developing agricultural nation to a start-up high-technology nation with more start-ups per capita than any nation on the planet. Those achievements were a result of close collaboration between business and Government, as well as a culture that rewarded risk-taking, embraced entrepreneurship and encouraged imagination. Stability, prosperity and sustainability depended on the empowerment of every member of society, particularly women and youth. The United Nations should place business creation and growth at the forefront of its development policies; the spark of ingenuity existed in every society.

22. **Mr. Khalil** (Egypt), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that the sponsors had shown no sign of flexibility during the negotiations and the Group of Arab States had determined its position only after the door to negotiations had been closed. The Group was committed to protecting the interests, dignity, development and right to life of the peoples of the Arab States. If the representative of Israel was concerned for their welfare, he should do everything in his power to alleviate their suffering.

(h) Harmony with Nature (*continued*) (A/C.2/67/L.37/Rev.1)

Draft resolution A/C.2/67/L.37/Rev.1: Harmony with Nature

23. **The Chair** said that the draft resolution had no programme budget implications.

24. **Mr. Quispe** (Plurinational State of Bolivia) made minor editorial corrections to the draft resolution, including, in paragraph 10, replacing the phrase "development agenda beyond 2015" with "post-2015 development agenda".

25. **Mr. Merabet** (Algeria), speaking on behalf of the Group of 77 and China, said that the members of the Group had become sponsors.

26. **The Chair** announced that Georgia and Ukraine had also joined the sponsors.

27. **Ms. Montel** (France) speaking on behalf of the European Union, expressed a reservation regarding the phrase "post-2015 development agenda", which had been introduced unilaterally and did not reflect the text agreed under the no-objection procedure.

28. **Mr. Quispe** (Plurinational State of Bolivia) said that the correction had been made during the adoption process for the sake of consistency with the other draft resolutions of the Committee.

29. *Draft resolution A/C.2/67/L.37/Rev.1, as orally corrected, was adopted.*

Agenda item 22: Globalization and interdependence (*continued*)

(a) Globalization and interdependence (*continued*) (A/C.2/67/L.12/Rev.1)

Draft resolution A/C.2/67/L.12/Rev.1: Promoting transparency, participation and accountability in fiscal policies

30. **The Chair** said that the draft resolution had no programme budget implications.

31. **Mr. Favero** (Brazil) made a minor editorial correction to the Spanish text of the draft resolution and said that Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Denmark, El Salvador, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Montenegro, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Nigeria, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sweden, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Ukraine, the United Kingdom and the United States of America had become sponsors.

32. **The Chair** announced that Guatemala, Iceland, Israel and the Republic of Moldova had also joined the sponsors.

33. *Draft resolution A/C.2/67/L.12/Rev.1, as orally corrected, was adopted.*

34. **Mr. Pescheux** (France) said that his delegation had some concerns regarding the French text, which it would communicate separately to the Secretariat.

Agenda item 23: Groups of countries in special situations (*continued*)

(a) Follow-up to the Fourth United Nations Conference on the Least Developed Countries (*continued*) (A/C.2/67/L.9, L.10, L.51 and L.53)

Draft resolutions A/C.2/67/L.9 and L.53: Follow-up to the Fourth United Nations Conference on the Least Developed Countries

35. **The Chair** invited the Committee to take action on draft resolution A/C.2/67/L.53, which had been submitted by Mr. Islam (Bangladesh), Vice-Chair, on the basis of informal consultations held on draft resolution A/C.2/67/L.9.

36. **Ms. de Laurentis** (Secretary of the Committee), reading out a statement of programme budget implications, said that the request for documentation contained in paragraph 15 of the draft resolution would add one 8,500-word document in all official languages to the workload of the Department for General Assembly and Conference Management, which would entail additional requirements in the amount of $50,900 for documentation services in 2014.

37. The expanded mandates called for in paragraphs 20, 21 and 28 would require strengthening the Office of the High Representative for the Least Developed Countries, Landlocked Developing Countries and Small Island Developing States (OHRLLS). Accordingly, that Office would require a total of 11 new posts — two senior economic affairs officers and one senior programme officer at the P-5 level; two programme officers and one economic affairs officer at the P-4 level; one programme officer, one economic affairs officer and one advocacy and outreach officer at the P-3 level; and one staff assistance and one research assistant at the GS-OL level — under section 10 of the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2014-2015 at a total cost of $3,424,600. Non-post resources in the amount of $871,700 would be required for office accommodation, commercial communications, supplies, furniture and equipment related to the establishment of the new posts.

38. Therefore, should the General Assembly adopt the draft resolution, requirements in the amount of $4,347,200, including $50,900 under section 2; $3,512,600 under section 10; and $783,700 under section 29D, would be included in the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2014-2015.

39. **Mr. Islam** (Bangladesh) said that the phrase "development agenda beyond 2015" in paragraph 24 should be changed to read "post-2015 development agenda".

40. *Draft resolution A/C.2/67/L.53, as orally corrected, was adopted.*

41. **Ms. Robl** (United States of America) said that her delegation shared the goals of the draft resolution and urged the international community to remain focused on the needs of the world's least developed countries, where development gains had been most difficult. She was particularly pleased to note the continued emphasis on the need for a broad consultative process in implementing the Istanbul Programme of Action and appreciated the calls for South-South cooperation.

42. However, the draft resolution also called for the provision of enhanced substantive and technical assistance to the least developed countries in a context that clearly emphasized external assistance flows and institutions, whereas the carefully crafted language of the Istanbul Programme of Action balanced calls for external support with acknowledgement of the importance of establishing national policies and enabling environments that would unlock domestic financing.

43. Furthermore, her delegation regretted that statements of programme budget implications were repeatedly provided at the last minute to the Member States engaged in negotiating draft resolutions; there should be increased transparency on budgetary figures during the negotiation process. Lastly, the draft resolution called for adequate resources for OHRLLS, but the Secretariat's statement went well beyond what was needed to support the draft resolution and the basis for its estimates was questionable as they had not been given adequate consideration by Member States. The Secretariat should re-evaluate its resources and staffing in light of the increasing budgetary constraints faced by Member States; her delegation looked forward to further discussion of the matter in the appropriate forums.

44. **Mr. Djebou** (Benin) said that the adoption of the draft resolution was important for the members of the Group of Least Developed Countries. It was essential for their development partners to meet their commitments and for OHRLLS and the international community to provide support in order to achieve the objective of allowing half of them to graduate to middle-income status by 2020, particularly in light of the substantially increased workload entailed by follow-up to the Istanbul Programme of Action.

45. **Mr. Latriche** (Observer for the European Union) said that the European Union attached great importance to its partnership with the least developed countries and OHRLLS in order to ensure that the United Nations system continued to focus on support for the least developed countries.

46. It was his understanding that the figures given by the Secretariat in its statement of programme budget implications were estimates, presented in accordance with an extensive interpretation of rule 153 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly. Those estimates did not prejudge the Secretary-General's submission to the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions and the Fifth Committee of the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2014-2015. Moreover, some of the estimates could not be considered requirements under the draft resolution. Therefore, the Secretariat's estimates should not be perceived as having been endorsed by Member States.

47. **Mr. Ozaki** (Japan) said that his delegation attached great importance to the sustained and inclusive development of the least developed countries. However, it regretted that the estimates relating to the proposed programme budget had not been issued until the night before the day on which action on the draft resolution was to have been taken, as a result of which its adoption had been delayed; cost estimates should be made available to Member States at the consultation stage of the negotiations.

48. His delegation had many questions and reservations with regard to the Secretariat's statement of programme budget implications, including the basis for its estimates; the costs related to the draft resolution should be absorbed by the Secretariat. The issue of the programme budget implications of the draft resolution should be addressed during consideration of the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2014-2015 in due course and the oral statement by the Secretariat should not be considered binding on Member States.

49. **Mr. Rodriguez Hernández** (Cuba) said that the Second Committee was charged with issuing mandates concerning sustainable development; it was the Fifth Committee that was mandated to examine programme budget implications. Instead of focusing on budgetary

issues, the Committee should address the important development questions concerning the least developed countries.

50. *Draft resolution A/C.2/67/L.9 was withdrawn.*

Draft resolutions A/C.2/67/L.10 and L.51: Smooth transition for countries graduating from the list of least developed countries

51. **The Chair** invited the Committee to take action on draft resolution A/C.2/67/L.51, which had been submitted by Mr. Islam (Bangladesh), Vice-Chair, on the basis of informal consultations held on draft resolution A/C.2/67/L.10.

52. **Ms. de Laurentis** (Secretary of the Committee), reading out a statement of programme budget implications, said that the request for documentation contained in paragraph 24 of the draft resolution would add one 8,500-word document in the six official languages to the documentation workload of the Department for General Assembly and Conference Management for 2015. Therefore, should the General Assembly adopt the draft resolution, additional requirements in the amount of $50,900 would be included in section 2 of the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2014-2015.

53. *Draft resolution A/C.2/67/L.51 was adopted.*

54. *Draft resolution A/C.2/67/L.10 was withdrawn.*

Agenda item 24: Eradication of poverty and other development issues (*continued*)

(a) Implementation of the Second United Nations Decade for the Eradication of Poverty (2008-2017) (*continued*) (A/C.2/67/L.11 and L.55)

Draft resolutions A/C.2/67/L.11 and L.55: Second United Nations Decade for the Eradication of Poverty (2008-2017) (*continued*)

55. **The Chair** invited the Committee to take action on draft resolution A/C.2/67/L.55, which had been submitted by Mr. Islam (Bangladesh), Vice-Chair, on the basis of informal consultations held on draft resolution A/C.2/67/L.11. The draft resolution contained no programme budget implications.

56. *Draft resolution A/C.2/67/L.55 was adopted.*

57. *Draft resolution A/C.2/67/L.11 was withdrawn.*

The meeting was suspended at 12.10 p.m. and resumed at 12.55 p.m.

Agenda item 20: Sustainable development (*continued*)

(g) Report of the Governing Council of the United Nations Environment Programme on its twelfth special session (*continued*) (A/C.2/67/L.21 and A/C.2/67/L.44*)

Draft resolutions A/C.2/67/L.21 and L.44: Report of the Governing Council of the United Nations Environment Programme on its twelfth special session and on the implementation of section IV.C entitled "Environmental pillar in the context of sustainable development" of the outcome document of the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development*

58. **The Chair** invited the Committee to take action on draft resolution A/C.2/67/L.44*, which had been submitted by Ms. Hodžić (Bosnia and Herzegovina), Rapporteur, on the basis of informal consultations held on draft resolution A/C.2/67/L.21.

59. **Ms. de Laurentis** (Secretary of the Committee), reading out a statement of programme budget implications, said that, should the draft resolution be adopted, the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) proposed to create for the biennium 2014-2015, with a view to its implementation, four posts pursuant to paragraph 4 (a) at an estimated cost of $1,453,900; 26 posts pursuant to paragraph 88 (c) at an estimated cost of $6,018,200; eight posts pursuant to paragraph 88 (d) at an estimated cost of $1,738,400; eight posts pursuant to paragraph 88 (e) at an estimated cost of $2,224,600; 29 posts pursuant to paragraph 88 (f) at an estimated cost of $5,428,100; 22 posts pursuant to paragraph 88 (g) at an estimated cost of $5,851,400; and eight posts pursuant to paragraph 88 (h) at an estimated cost of $1,683,700.

60. A total of $10,286,000 was estimated for the funding of non-post resources associated with the proposed enhanced UNEP secretariat and activities, including recurrent operational costs associated with the established resources; non-recurrent operational costs related to the establishment of new staff; official travel; equipment and supplies; translation of publications into official United Nations languages; enhancement of the Global Environment Outlook process; and capacity-building and access to technology.

61. The total proposed amount of $34,734,300 for the implementation of paragraph 4 (a) of the draft resolution would be included under section 14 of the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2014-2015. The financial implications of paragraphs 4 (b) and (c) would be determined once the Governing Council of UNEP had adopted new rules and procedures at its first universal session, to be held in Nairobi in February 2013.

62. **Mr. Laguna** (Mexico) made minor editorial changes to the draft resolution and said that it contained the seeds of implementation of an ambitious package of international environmental governance measures that would strengthen the environmental pillar of sustainable development. It sought to reflect the consensus within the General Assembly that it was necessary to strengthen UNEP and empower its Governing Council to implement all the measures called for in paragraphs 88 (a) to (h) of the Rio+20 outcome document.

63. It also sent a political message: by adopting the draft resolution, the Committee would not be endorsing any specific amount of resources; rather, it would be providing the Secretary-General, the Governing Council of UNEP, the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions and the Fifth Committee with guidance as to how to provide secure, stable, adequate and increased financial resources to UNEP from the regular budget of the Organization. The resources requirements set out by the Secretariat were merely indicative and would require intergovernmental negotiations in order to determine the final resource and financial implications of the draft resolution.

64. *Draft resolution A/C.2/67/L.44*, as orally corrected, was adopted.*

65. **The Chair** said that as the hour was late, the interpreters would have to leave. He took it that the Committee agreed to continue in English only.

66. *It was so decided.*

67. **Mr. Latriche** (Observer for the European Union) said that the European Union welcomed the adoption of the draft resolution and the decision to upgrade UNEP. It stressed the importance of implementing paragraph 88 of the Rio+20 outcome document and looked forward to the first universal session of the Governing Council of UNEP.

68. It was his understanding that the Secretariat's statement of programme budget implications was based on estimates presented through an overly extensive interpretation of rule 153 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly. He reiterated the position of the European Union that such considerations would need to be further revised in light of the new mandate entrusted to the Governing Council and that the Secretariat's estimates did not prejudge the Secretary-General's submission of the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2014-2015 to the Advisory Committee and the Fifth Committee. Therefore, the estimates should not be perceived as having been endorsed by Member States.

69. **Ms. Cousens** (United States of America) said that the reforms agreed at Rio+20 would strengthen the role of UNEP, promote the environmental component of sustainable development and improve coordination on environmental activities in the United Nations system, all of which were welcome improvements. The draft resolution endorsed the decisions contained in the Rio+20 outcome document and took the essential next step of establishing universal membership in the Governing Council of UNEP and empowering the Council to initiate implementation of that document. Her delegation was therefore dismayed by the content of the Secretariat's statement of programme budget implications, which prejudged the decisions of the Governing Council, had been received at a late stage in the negotiations and contained substantial and unexpected requests for resources that were not explained and bore no relation to the draft resolution.

70. Her delegation questioned the basis for those figures as they had not been adequately considered by Member States in any appropriate intergovernmental forum; Member States required a rational examination of resource requirements, not an opaque, unsubstantiated request for significant new resources. The draft resolution mandated the Governing Council as the most appropriate forum for discussing UNEP resource requirements in light of Rio+20. It would therefore fall to the Council to review the proposed programme of work of UNEP and to take decisions on follow-up activities in implementation of the decisions taken at the Conference.

71. The information provided by the Secretariat was only the beginning of what should be a more extensive conversation within the Governing Council, pursuant to paragraph 4 (b) of the draft resolution, based on a

more detailed analysis of planned activities and expected results. Until that time, the Secretariat had no credible basis for its projected resources requirements for the newly expanded mandate of UNEP.

72. **Ms. Onishi** (Japan) said that her delegation was puzzled by the content of the Secretariat's statement in connection with draft resolution L.44* as it gave a very detailed estimate of costs before the new Governing Council of UNEP had had an opportunity to discuss and agree on how to implement elements of the Rio+20 outcome document. Her delegation expected the Secretary-General to respect the provisions of paragraph 5 (a) of the draft resolution, which requested him to reflect in the 2014-2015 biennium budget proposal resources that took into account the proposed revised programme of work of the United Nations Environment Programme and the implementation of paragraph 88 (a) to (h) of the outcome document of the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development, as well as opportunities for increasing the efficient use of resources. The Secretariat's statement of programme budget implications for the draft resolution should in no way prejudge the Secretary-General's proposed programme budget for the biennium 2014-2015; once that document had been issued, her delegation would consider it carefully and, in so doing, would not be bound by the Secretariat's statement.

73. **Mr. Maksimychev** (Russian Federation) expressed concern that an official meeting was continuing without interpretation into all official languages of the Organization. He hoped that such an occurrence would not be repeated.

74. On the issue of the programme budget implications, his delegation believed that the Secretariat's estimates would be subject to further consultation within the Advisory Committee and the Fifth Committee.

75. **Ms. Volken** (Switzerland) said that introduction of the principle of universal membership in the Governing Council of UNEP was significant. The first universal session of the Council, to be held in February 2013, would provide an opportunity for fruitful discussion of ways to implement paragraph 88 of the Rio+20 outcome document.

76. Her delegation had taken note of the Secretariat's statement of programme budget implications as required under rule 153 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, which would not prejudge discussions in the Governing Council.

77. **Ms. Peterson** (Canada) said that the draft resolution was an important step towards implementation of the decisions taken at Rio+20, which would be further elaborated upon at the first universal session of the Governing Council. However, the Secretariat's statement of programme budget implications did not accurately reflect the decisions taken by Member States during the negotiations; moreover, it prejudged important upcoming discussions among Member States. Her delegation disagreed with several elements of that statement and reserved the right to revisit them in detail in the appropriate forums.

78. *Draft resolution A/C.2/67/L.21 was withdrawn.*

The meeting rose at 1.30 p.m.